



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,197	11/17/2003	Ji-Young Moon	Q77283	9563
23373 7590 01/22/2008 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER GERGISO, TECHANE	
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/22/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,197

Applicant(s)

MOON, JI-YOUNG

ExaminerTechane J. Gergiso **76****Art Unit**

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 8-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7, 14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a Final Office Action in response to the applicant's communication filed application filed on November 17, 2003.
2. The applicant added new claims 14 and 15.
3. Claims 12-13 are canceled.
4. Claims 1-11 and 14-15 have been examined and are pending.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on November 13, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
6. The applicant amended claims 9 and 10 to overcome the 35 U.S.C §101 rejection. The examiner disagrees with the applicant's amendments do not overcome the 35 U.S.C §101 for the following reasons:

Claim 9 does not provide the intended result which is "A spatial masking for use in moving picture." Claim 9 is limited only to storing an extracted edges from a contrast adjusted moving frame and therefore lacks a useful result.

Claim 10 does not provide the intended result which is "A motion masking for use in watermarking a moving picture." Claim 10 is limited to only to storing extracted edges from a current frame and therefore lacks a useful result.

7. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

8. The applicant argues in (page 7: second paragraph) that "For instance, Applicants submit that Tewfik does not disclose or suggest that a global masking value is obtained through separately performed masking operations. Tewfik discloses a method to calculate a signal to mask ratio for each sub band of an input audio stream in col. 4, lines 34-57. In this portion, Tewfik merely discloses that a **determination of the global masking threshold is carried out (step 7) after the calculation of individual masking thresholds** (step 6). Tewfik does not disclose that the **global masking threshold is determined based on the calculated individual masking thresholds**. It is altogether silent regarding how the global masking threshold is calculated." The examiner disagrees with the applicant's argument because the order or sequence of steps which the applicant is trying to suggest basing the argument is not relevant in Tewfik or the applicant is not explaining the differences between the cited sections. The applicant also argues that there is no reason to combine Tewfik. Again the examiner disagrees because Tewfik is used to teach in the combination to obtain a global masking value through separate masking operations and obtaining global is obtained in the same way whether the data is an image data or audio data.

9. Regarding claims 9 and 10, the applicant argues that Kraft is not teaching extracting edges from a contrast adjusted image. The examiner disagrees with the applicant because Kraft

discloses mask is performed with location based on image elements or pixels. And the detail contrast is determined on the basis of an image subject to a removal process. Therefore, edges of an imaged are address by pixels and subject to a removal or extraction process. (Kraft: column 2: lines 40-48; column 4: lines 25-45).

10. For the above given reasons, the applicant argument and amendment are not persuasive to overcome the prior arts in record to place independent claims 1, 9 and 10 in condition for allowance. Dependent claims depending from claim 1 directly or indirectly are also no placed in condition for allowance based on their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. Claims 9 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention (claim 9: lines 5: **storing the extracted edges in a recording medium and** claim 10: lines 5: **storing the extracted edges in a recording medium**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

12. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

13. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 9 is directed to “a spatial masking method, comprising the steps of: adjusting contrast of a moving image frame; and extracting edges from the contrast-adjusted frame.” This claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomenon) since it fails to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a **useful result** because the **claimed subject matter fails to sufficiently reflect at least one practical utility** set forth in the descriptive portion of the specification. More specifically, while the described practical utility is directed to “*providing a watermarking method, which inserts a watermark into a moving image depending on a global masking method in which the characteristics of respective masking methods are combined together in consideration of HVS and the present invention selects a combination method expressed by $G=F+S+M$ Equation so as to apply global masking, in which frequency, spatial and motion masking effects are taken into consideration together, to an image; where G , F , S and M represent a global masking value, a frequency masking value, a spatial masking value*

*and a motion masking value, respectively (disclosure 0006 and 0039) ” the subject matter relates ONLY to, **adjusting contrast of a moving image frame; and extracting edges from the contrast-adjusted frame.***

In addition, the claimed subject matter does not produce a **tangible result** because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having a real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, **a computation, or manipulated data**. More specifically, **the claimed subject matter provides adjusting contrast of a moving image frame, and extracting edges from the contrast-adjusted frame**. This produced result remains in the abstract and, thus fails to achieve the required status of having real world value.

Claim 10 is directed to “a motion masking method, comprising the steps of: obtaining a luminance difference between a current frame and a previous frame; and extracting edges from the current frame.” This claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomenon) since it fails to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a **useful result** because the **claimed subject matter fails to sufficiently reflect at least one practical utility** set forth in the descriptive portion of the specification. More specifically, while the described practical utility is directed to “*providing a watermarking method, which inserts a watermark into a moving image depending on a global masking method in which the characteristics of respective masking methods are combined together in consideration of HVS and the present invention selects a combination method expressed by $G=F+S+M$*

*Equation so as to apply global masking, in which frequency, spatial and motion masking effects are taken into consideration together, to an image; where G, F, S and M represent a global masking value, a frequency masking value, a spatial masking value and a motion masking value, respectively (disclosure 0006 and 0039) ” the subject matter relates ONLY to, **obtaining a luminance difference between a current frame and a previous frame; and extracting edges from the current frame.***

Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a tangible result because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having a real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, **a computation, or manipulated data**. More specifically, **the claimed subject matter provides obtaining a luminance difference between a current frame and a previous frame; and extracting edges from the current frame**. This produced result remains in the abstract and, thus fails to achieve the required status of having real world value.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, the amendments to independent claims 9 and 10 are not persuasive nor substantial to overcome with regard to the 101 rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 1, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hannigan et al. (hereinafter referred to as Hannigan, US Pat No.: 6,535,617) in view of Tewfik et al. (hereinafter referred to as Tewfik, US Pat. No.: 6,061,793)

As per claims 1 and 11:

Hannigan disclose a moving image watermarking method using a human visual system, and A computer readable medium including program codes executable by a computer to perform a moving image watermarking method using a human visual system, comprising:

- a) obtaining a watermark value by exclusive-ORing a random key value and a binary value of a logo image (Column 15: lines 13-30; Spread spectrum modulation);
- b) separately performing a plurality of masking operations (column 10: lines 60-67; column 11: lines 1-15)
- d) obtaining a watermarked frame value by adding a watermark value weighted by the global masking value and a control variable to an original frame value (figure 8: 810; global gain; 3.4: Gain control and Perceptual Analysis; column 17: lines 26-38.); and

e) inserting a watermark into a moving image frame using the watermarked frame value
(column 8: lines 2-15; 2.1: Image Water Embedder; 3.0: Embedder
Implementation; column 14: lines 37-55);

Hannigan does not explicitly teach c) obtaining a global masking value through the separate masking operations. Tewfik, in an analogous art teaches obtaining a global masking value through the separate masking operations (column 3: lines 56-67; column 4: lines 53; column 5: lines 54-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Hannigan to include obtaining a global masking value through the separate masking operations. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the desire to provide hiding of data, including watermarks, in human-perceptible sounds, that is, audio host data and employ perceptual masking models to determine the optimal locations within host data to insert the hidden data or watermark as suggested by Tewfik in (column 2: lines 40-45).

As per claim 8:

Hannigan disclose a watermarking method extracting the watermark, comprising the steps of: subtracting the watermarked frame value from an original frame value to obtain a subtracted result value; and exclusive-ORing the subtracted result value and a random variable obtained by a key value, and obtaining an exclusive-ORed result (Column 15: lines 13-30; Spread spectrum modulation).

17. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft (US Pat No.: 6, 954, 549) in view of Hannigan et al. (hereinafter referred to as Hannigan, US Pat No.: 6,535,617).

As per claim 9:

Kraft discloses a spatial masking method for use in watermarking a moving picture comprising the steps of: adjusting contrast of an image frame; and extracting edges from the contrast-adjusted frame and storing the extracted edges in a recording medium (column 2: lines 6-15).

Kraft does not explicitly teach the frame is a moving image and a special masking. Hannigan, in an analogous art however teaches the frame is a moving image and a special masking (column 11: lines 20-65; 2.2 overview of a detector and reader). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Kraft to include the frame is a moving image and a special masking. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the desire to provide a method of removing fixed pattern noise from a media signal as suggested by Hannigan in (column 1: lines 50-61).

As per claim 10:

Kraft discloses motion masking method for use in watermarking a moving picture comprising the steps of: obtaining a luminance difference between a current frame and a

previous frame; and extracting edges from the current frame and storing the extracted edges in a recording medium (column 2: lines 6-15)

Kraft does not explicitly teach a motion masking. Hannigan, in an analogous art however teaches teach a motion masking (column 11: lines 20-65; 2.2 overview of a detector and reader). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Kraft to include teach a motion masking. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the desire to provide a method of removing fixed pattern noise from a media signal as suggested by Hannigan in (column 1: lines 50-61).

As per claim 12 and 13:

The spatial masking method, comprising the extracted edges in a recording medium (recording a data in a medium would have been obvious to an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time of the invention).

Allowable Subject Matter

18. Claims 2-7 and 14-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

19. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Conventional method of inserting a watermark into a Moving Picture Expert Group (MPEG)-2 bit stream cannot be applied to various bit rates or encoding methods, and is limited in the capacity of insert able watermark data due to a limitation in the bit rate thereof. A moving image watermarking method as it is, is problematic in that it does not take a correlation and motion change between moving image frames into consideration. It is important to maintain the invisibility of a watermark while maintaining the robustness thereof, a Human Visual System (HVS) has been generally used to insert a watermark into a region less sensitive to human eyes. Conventional methods mainly use frequency masking characteristics to insert a watermark into a Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT) domain and these methods do not consider spatial localization characteristics, a watermark inserted into the DCT domain is spread over all frames, which causes a problem in that a watermark can even be inserted into a region with an insufficient masking effect, such as a uniform region.

The present invention to accomplish the above objects, is provides a moving image watermarking method using a human visual system comprising the steps of obtaining a watermark value by exclusive-ORing a random key value and a binary value of a logo image; separately performing a plurality of masking operations; obtaining a global masking value through the separate masking operations; and obtaining a watermarked frame value by adding a watermark value weighted by the global masking value and a control variable to an original frame value and separately performing a plurality of masking operations comprises the steps of performing a spatial masking operation; and performing a motion masking operation.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

See the notice of reference cited in form PTO-892 for additional prior art

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Techane J. Gergiso whose telephone number is (571) 272-3784. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)

Application/Control Number:
10/713,197
Art Unit: 2137

Page 14

272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/T.G/

January 16, 2008


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER